UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X Docket#

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 21-cr-00065(RJD-2)

:

- versus - : U.S. Courthouse

: Brooklyn, New York

MARTINELLI LINARES, ET AL.,

: December 11, 2021

Defendants :

:

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT M. LEVY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S: (VIA VIDEO/AUDIO)

For the Government: Breon S. Peace, Esq.
United States Attorney

BY: Alixandra Smith, Esq.
Michael Harper, Esq.
Barbara Levy, Esq.

Assistant U.S. Attorneys 271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

For the Defendant: Sean Hecker, Esq.
Justin Horton, Esq.

Kaplan Hecker & Fink LLP

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 7110

New York, NY 10118

<u>Transcription Service</u>: Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

61 Beatrice Avenue

West Islip, New York 11795 RL.Transcriptions2@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

```
2
                            Proceedings
              THE CLERK: We're here for an arraignment in
 1
 2
   United States v. Ricardo Martinelli Linares, Case Number
 3
   21-cr-65. Would counsel state their appearances for the
   record beginning with the government?
 4
 5
              MS. SMITH: Good afternoon, your Honor.
 6
   Alixandra Smith for the United States. And with me on
 7
   the line are also trial attorneys Michael Harper and
 8
   Barbara Levy from the Department of Justice.
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
 9
10
              MR. HECKER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Sean
   Hecker from Kaplan, Hecker & Fink for Mr. Martinelli
11
12
   Linares, and I'm joined by my colleague, Justin Horton.
13
              THE COURT: Good afternoon. Good afternoon,
14
         How do you like to be referred to, Mr. Martinelli
15
   or Mr. Martinelli Linares?
16
              THE DEFENDANT: Hello, your Honor. Mr.
   Martinelli is fine.
17
18
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. So Mr.
19
   Martinelli, can you hear me well?
20
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: And are you in the same room with
22
   your lawyer?
23
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am, your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: Are you able to speak to him and --
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.
```

```
3
                            Proceedings
              THE COURT: Can you do so privately if you need
 1
 2
   to?
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
              THE COURT: Okay. And you can do that by
 4
 5
   muting the mic if you need to.
 6
              All right. So the first order of business
7
   today is that we're all appearing by video. The only
   individuals who are in the same room are Mr. Martinelli
 8
 9
   and his counsel. The reason we're appearing by video
10
   today is because we're still in the midst of a pandemic
    and it is considered not safe for us to all appear in a
11
12
    courtroom at this time.
13
              Mr. Martinelli, you do have a right, however,
14
   to appear live and in person in a court proceeding with
15
    all the parties there. And so the question I'm going to
16
   ask you is whether after consulting with your lawyer you
17
   are willing to waive your right to appear in person and
18
   live at this time and to proceed remotely. Let me ask
19
   that question to your lawyer first.
20
              MR. HECKER: Yes.
21
              THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your
22
   client?
23
              MR. HECKER: I have, your Honor, and he's
24
   prepared to waive his in person appearance today.
25
              THE COURT: Mr. Martinelli, is that true? Do
```

```
4
                            Proceedings
1
   you waive your in person appearance today?
 2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 3
              THE COURT: Are you making this decision
   voluntarily?
 4
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
              THE COURT: Anybody force you or threatened you
 6
 7
   or made you any promises to induce you to proceed
 8
   remotely?
 9
              THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: And do you have any questions about
11
   how this process works?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: All right. I'm going to advise you
14
   that you have a right to remain silent. Anything you say
15
   here today can be used against you. Even if you've
16
   already made statements to the government, you don't have
17
   to say anything else. Because you and your lawyer are so
18
   close to each other, you can consult with each other
19
   privately at any point and feel free to mute the mic if
20
   that's what you wish to do. Do you have any questions?
21
              THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: All right. You're here today
23
    following an extradition from Guatemala on an indictment
24
   that has criminal charges against you. Have you had a
25
    chance to either read the indictment or discuss the
```

```
5
                            Proceedings
1
    charges with your lawyer?
 2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 3
              THE COURT: Do you understand the charges?
              THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: I'm going to ask the government
 6
   very briefly to explain or summarize the charges against
 7
   Mr. Martinelli.
 8
              MS. SMITH: Sure, your Honor. The defendant
 9
   has been charged in a five count indictment. He's
10
    charged in the first three counts with one count of
11
    conspiracy to commit money laundering, and two counts of
12
    substantive money laundering for his involvement in
13
   facilitating laundering more than $20 million in bribes
14
    from a Brazilian company called Odebrecht to a senior
15
   government official in Panama who is a close relative.
16
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you. Mr. Hecker, would you
17
   like the Court to read the indictment publically?
18
              MR. HECKER: No, your Honor. We'll waive
19
   reading.
20
              THE COURT: And how does Mr. Martinelli plead?
21
              MR. HECKER: Your Honor, Mr. Martinelli has
22
    signed a plea agreement and has a change of plea
23
   proceeding scheduled for before Judge Dearie on Tuesday,
24
   so we'll wait until Tuesday to formally enter his plea.
25
   So for purposes of today's proceeding, he'll enter a not
```

1 | guilty plea.

THE COURT: Thank you. What's the government's position on -- well, let me advise you all that I have read your papers and I've read the transcript of the hearing for Mr. Martinelli's brother, Luis Martinelli, before Judge Henry and Judge Dearie, so I'm familiar with your arguments, but I would like to hear your argument on the bail issue if you wish to present it. Shall we start with the government?

MS. SMITH: Sure, your Honor. As you said, we filed sort of a ten-page letter as well as the transcript of the bail hearings for Luis Martinelli, Mr.

Martinelli's brother and co-defendant, which took place before Judge Henry and Judge Dearie. And obviously, I think a lot of the facts here are the same.

That said, our position is that the defendant is a risk of flight and there are not conditions sufficient to ensure his return to court for the duration of this case. And in any event, that the package that's presented is certainly insufficient.

So as set forth in our papers, the defendant is a risk of flight given the nature and seriousness of the crimes which I have just described. And we've identified sort of more information for you on the senior government official involved in a sealed filing that was provided to

Proceedings

you which the defense also has. And obviously, the weight of the evidence which I think is made clear by the fact that the defendant fled in June of 2020 sort of knowing what the evidence was and being engaged in plea negotiations and the fact that he's agreed to plea on Tuesday. So that factor obviously weighs in favor of detention.

We've described in some detail the flight from the United States in June 2020. There were not charges pending at that time but the parties were engaged in plea negotiations and were exchanging papers and very close to sort of finalizing a plea. And as we set forth our papers, the defendant and his brother left the United States without informing the government, used a private jet to evade U.S. border patrols, and then sort of hopscotched around Central America in an attempt to get back to Panama which was locked down because of the COVID 19 crisis.

He used invalid diplomatic credentials to cross the border into Guatemala which said he was a member of the Central American Parliament and he was not. And then he and his brother got a waiver from the Panama Ministry of Health to get back into Panama when the country was locked down and was arrested on a private jet in Guatemala that was destined back for Panama.

## Proceedings

So he obviously went to great lengths to flee the United States at that time. And he did so even though there were charges pending in the criminal case in Panama. And so he made the decision at that time that he would fare better there which is sort of the same circumstances that were here. And once he was in Guatemala and had been arrested, he fought extradition. He did so until the point at which his brother, you know, his appeals were exhausted and was going to be extradited. And at that point only agreed to waive his remaining challenges and be extradited to the United States.

So obviously, that flight, which I think Judge Dearie in particular found very persuasive and I think shows that the defendant has the means and also the incentive to flea because like I said, the charges that are described in his papers were pending in Panama in June of 2020 just as they are today.

He obviously has extensive political connections in Panama, extensive family wealth. In addition to the I believe 3.2 million in cash and 4.2 million in real estate that's detailed in the Pretrial Services report, he obviously has access to extensive family wealth. He has citizenship in both Panama and Italy. And obviously that Panama does not extradite its

9

own citizens is another fact.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then in addition to everything else, the package that's been presented is insufficient, so we don't believe that there's any package that would be sufficient, but this one in particular is definitely not. It represents a tiny fraction of his person wealth. Not just what was again disclosed in the Pretrial Services report but also what he has access to through his family. It is dwarfed by the almost \$19 million in forfeiture obligations that he will be on the hook for once he pleads on Tuesday. And we have no information on the suretors. They're described only as close friends. We have no idea sort of who they are, what moral suasion they might have over the defendant, what their wealth is such that the percentage of what they might be willing to put up for the bond, sort of what that impact would be on those suretors. And I note that Pretrial Services was not able to contact any of them this morning. And I also just note that it is a smaller package than was presented by his brother before Judge Dearie and was rejected.

And then the final point that I'll make which we made in our papers was that Mr. Martinelli is going to plead guilty on Tuesday as scheduled. The presumption then flips for him to show that he is not a risk of flight from the presumption that we're dealing with now.

So that's even a higher burden if he does in fact plead on Tuesday.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Hecker?

MR. HECKER: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

We're prepared to treat this as if he has already pled guilty because he signed a plea agreement last week after much back and forth with the government and he did so because he made a decision. He made a decision some time ago to voluntarily return to this country, resolve these charges, attempt to do so in a way that would result in protection from subsequent prosecution for the same underlying conduct in Panama which is the reason that the parties have negotiated a proper statement of facts which is not, you know, typical in this district.

And he did all of those things because he obviously at this juncture has every intention of resolving this case, pleading guilty on Tuesday, and going before Judge Dearie and asking for a sentence of time served. The reason he's asking for a sentence of time served is because it's an incredibly reasonable sentence under all of the facts and circumstances of this case. Mr. Martinelli Linares has been in Guatemala in prison for over 17 months. He and his brother are accused of being effectively middlemen in a corruption

scheme involving the Odebrecht scandal which Ms. Smith made reference to.

The only other defendant has been successfully prosecuted in the United States was the CEO of Braskem. In that case, the government agreed to recommend a sentence of no more than 60 months imprisonment before Judge Dearie. Judge Dearie gave Mr. Grubisich 20 months in prison. He will not serve more than the 17 months that Mr. Martinelli and his brother have already served.

And under the circumstances, there is no logical reason in the world for Mr. Martinelli to plead guilty and then go back to Panama. It would disrupt the entire justification for the proceeding that we're moving forward with on Tuesday and for sentencing.

To the extent that the bail package that we've offered in the government's view, or in the Court's view more importantly, is insufficient, we're prepared to bolster it. We in fact provided Pretrial Services with the names of seven friends. We gave cell numbers. We identified all of these people. And I think the Pretrial Services officer will confirm that it wasn't a function of her not being able to contact these people because they didn't pick up or something, it's because she didn't have time this morning to do it. But these are all people who know our client well from school when he

Proceedings

attended Georgetown University from his subsequent time in San Francisco. These are close friends, people willing to post property if need be. We had in our letter made a proposal of a package, a four and a half million dollar personal recognizance bond secured by \$1 million of his own funds, plus security from these other suretors. We're prepared to increase that to the extent that it's the sufficiency of the package we're talking about.

makes very clear that he is not a flight risk. It would be a completely irrational decision to take. He doesn't have his travel documents. Counsel's in possession of his Panamanian passport. His Italian passport, which he has by reason of his birth, is already in ICE custody as far as I understand it. And there is no reason for him to flee. So we view this as a very simple argument. The circumstances are actually different from those that were before Judge Dearie when the government suggested that maybe it wasn't clear whether the plea would go forward.

Mr. Martinelli's brother has already pled guilty. He's going to be -- he himself is going to plead guilty on Tuesday and there is literally no reason for him to flee.

If I might just make a couple of other brief

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

13

points which were referenced in our letter but I think important, if he's detained pending sentencing, he'll be staying at the MDC. He's had two vaccination shots and a booster shot. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding our providing all of that information to legal at the MDC, we're told he must be quarantined. It appears he's going to be quarantined in a small cell with another recent arrestee. His brother spent 18 days in quarantine. Quarantine means being in your cell for all but 30 minutes a day every other day. You get 30 minutes out of your cell. It is frankly inhumane to be treated that wav. My client doesn't need to be treated that way but yet MDC is insisting on a quarantine status which is supposed to be 14. As I said, his brother had 18 days. And we think that's another reason for granting bail in a case like this. It would be unduly punitive, unnecessarily punitive to hold him at the MDC pending sentencing in this case. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Is there anything else the government would like to say? MS. SMITH: Yes, your Honor, just to very briefly respond. With respect to Mr. Grubisich, who's the other Odebrecht defendant that Mr. Hecker referred to, his sentence was actually capped at ten years because

Proceedings

he pled to very different charges. He did not plead to money laundering charges. He didn't flee the country in connection with his case. And he actually had a significant bail package that he was released on at \$30 million and a number of suretors including family members. And I do think that the sentencing factors are going to weigh differently for these defendants than for Mr. Grubisich.

In terms of the argument that it would be irrational to flee at this point, I do point out this is the exact point that we were at in June 2020 when the defendant chose to leave the country. And as we set forth in our filing, I think there's a real question about this idea of wrapping up the charges here and in Panama that the charges there may not carry the same kind of serious sentence and that given the nature of the political connections, that the consequences there may not be as serious here and that is a reason to flee.

In terms of the travel documents, obviously we've seen that the defendant can access diplomatic credentials that were invalid and sort of otherwise access ways to get into the country that are not the standard approach for most Panamanian citizens. The waiver that they got in June 2020 was one that was not available to everyday citizens. So I think the idea that

certain of his travel documents are in the possession of ICE or Pretrial is not sufficient here.

And finally on the MDC point, I just want to put on the record that there is a mandatory 14-day quarantine period. The defendant's not treated any differently than anybody else. And for his brother, at the end of the 14-day period there's another test that's conducted, a PCR test, to determine whether or not the defendant is still -- does not have COVID, and that did take a number of days to come back which explains the 18 days. And I think per BOP regs it actually says 14 to 21 days. So it's obviously unfortunate but it is because of the pandemic and those procedures were sort of followed the same way with all defendants at the MDC.

MR. HECKER: Your Honor, if I may just briefly?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HECKER: I mean the entirety of the government's argument rests on this claim that it's the exact same situation that existed when they left the United States in June of 2020, and that's just obviously not accurate. There were no pending charges. There were plea discussions, but there were no pending charges.

There was no court order that they remain in the country. I understand that the government's upset about the prior set of circumstances. It was unfortunate. It was

Proceedings

obviously a mistake. Our client spent 17 months in Guatemalan prison in the interim. His brother has already pled guilty and he's pleading guilty on Tuesday. I mean the notion that it's the same circumstances, I mean it doesn't require a whole lot of thinking through that logic to understand why it's simply wrong.

And it is true that the government agreed in Mr. Grubisich's case to allow a plea to two counts, each of which had a maximum of five years, and they recommended five years and Judge Dearie gave two, but the underlying conduct is he was the CEO of a company who paid hundreds of millions of dollars in bribes. And the government hasn't suggested and couldn't possibly suggest that Mr. Martinelli is more culpable than Mr. Grubisich.

So we feel quite strongly about our position.

Obviously that's going to be a decision for the judge to make after getting a pre-sentence report. But that's the mind set of our client as he made the decision over a month ago to give up his extradition fight and to come here voluntarily to resolve this matter. So it's just not true that it's the same circumstance that existed previously.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you both.

I've spent a lot of time thinking about this case and I've read, as I said, I've read the transcripts

17

1 of the hearings, et cetera. Under 3142(g), looking at 2 the factors that the Court has to consider, I don't think 3 there's a lot of disagreement about most of them. nature of the offense, I think we all understand what the 4 offense was and it has serious ramifications. The weight 5 6 of the evidence, I think the weight of the evidence is 7 great whether you make that conclusion because the 8 defendant has chosen to plead guilty or because of the 9 properties that have been made. I just don't think 10 there's much dispute there. The history and characteristics of the defendant, again, I don't think 11 12 there's a lot in dispute about that. And the real 13 question is whether or not there are conditions or a 14 combination of conditions under which he could be 15 released that would assure his appearance in court or 16 protect the community. 17 I don't see this as a danger to the community 18 I think we're just talking about risk of flight. 19 And I think my decision isn't going to be made in a 20 It's being made in context of what's happened 21 over the last couple of years and particularly in the 22 context of Mr. Martinelli's brother's hearing before 23 Judge Dearie, what Judge Dearie said and what Judge Henry 24 had concluded.

So we'll start that Mr. Martinelli is not a

25

## Proceedings

U.S. citizen. He's a citizen of Panama and Italy. He doesn't have any deep roots in this district. His family resides primarily in Panama, a country that does not provide for extradition of its citizens. He does have access to substantial financial resources. He is politically connected at very high levels of power in Panama. And he has used his influence and his resources allegedly through bribes to influence others and also in his escape, or at least his leaving the country a couple of years ago in obtaining bogus identification cards and an emergency humanitarian authorization to enter Panama. So we know that his connections are not just theoretical as to what they can do, but they could produce a result, they could be deployed.

He left the United States before a plea was finalized. He did so in a way that as we see in other cases would be described as trying to evade detection. He took a boat to the Bahamas. He took a private jet that was headed for Panama where there is not an extradition possibility. It was through the vagaries and the bad luck of COVID that the plane was turned away and he had to go to Costa Rica, El Salvador, and ultimately Guatemala. He attempted to use a private family jet to get him out of Guatemala to fly to Panama again using diplomatic credentials that were not valid. And he spent

Proceedings

a lot of time in Guatemala where he fought extradition for a period of time and only after his brother's extradition essentially was granted did he decide to give up the battle. There are a lot of reasons to say that he chose to leave under circumstances that one might call flight.

You know, judges have to make decisions in a vacuum sometimes and often we're asked to have crystal balls to decide whether a defendant is going to be dangerous or going to flee. We never know. We can't predict the future with all accuracy. But what we can do is we can look at past events and what happened. The strongest argument for the government is look at what happened when he left the country and the way he did it and the way he used his credentials and influence. And the defense's argument is well things have changed now.

I think Judge Dearie made clear how he views the circumstances and I think ultimately he's right. He said in the old dictum fool me once shame on you, fool me twice shame on me. And I think where I ultimately come down here. And I think that there is a difference between asking for release on bail today before the guilty plea and asking for release after the guilty plea. And that I think is where your strongest argument may come after the plea of guilty has actually taken place,

Proceedings

something which was scheduled to happen, or not scheduled to happen but anticipated, before, Mr. Martinelli, you left the country.

So I do find that based on the facts of what you have done in the past that you are a risk of flight and all the factors I just discussed. And I think it'll be up to you and your lawyer to convince Judge Dearie after the guilty plea on Tuesday that the circumstances have indeed changed and that you can be trusted at that point.

So my decision is that you are a risk of flight at this point, but I'm not making any prediction or statement as to whether or not you would continue to be a risk of flight after you plead guilty. So that's my ruling.

And with respect to the MDC, I'm sorry to have to put anyone in the MDC. I've had enough experience with the MDC, and I think the government has as well, to know that it's not where we would like to send anyone. But unfortunately, the COVID restrictions do have to apply. There's a reason for them. And even if the Court disagreed, the Court doesn't have any power to affect those quarantines. So that's the Court's ruling at this time.

I'm going to read an order. Under Federal Rule

```
21
                            Proceedings
   of Criminal Procedure 5(f) I direct the prosecution to
 1
 2
   comply with its obligation under Brady v. Maryland and
   its progeny to disclose to the defense all information
 3
   whether admissible or not that is favorable to the
 4
   defendant material either to quilt or to punishment and
 5
 6
   known to the prosecution. Possible consequences for
 7
   noncompliance may include dismissal of individual charges
   or the entire case, exclusion of evidence, and
 8
 9
   professional discipline or court sanctions on the
10
    attorneys responsible.
              I will be entering a written order more fully
11
12
   describing this obligation and the possible consequences
13
   a failing to meet it, and I direct the prosecution to
14
   review and comply with that order. Even though a guilty
15
   plea is scheduled for Tuesday, Brady certainly still
16
   applies.
17
              Ms. Smith, does the prosecution confirm that it
18
   understands its obligations and will fulfill them even at
19
   this late stage of the proceedings?
20
                          Yes, your Honor.
              MS. SMITH:
21
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Is there
22
    anything else from the government?
23
              MS. SMITH:
                          No, your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: From the defense?
25
              MR. HECKER: No, your Honor.
```

```
22
                             Proceedings
              THE COURT: All right. And good luck, Mr.
 1
 2
   Martinelli. And my decision shouldn't cast any doubt as
 3
   to the quality of representation you received from Mr.
   Hecker. He did an excellent job.
 4
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: Thank you.
                          (Matter concluded)
 7
 8
                                -000-
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## CERTIFICATE

I, MARY GRECO, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic sound-recording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this  ${\color{red} {\bf 13th}}$  day of  ${\color{red} {\bf December}},$  2021.

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

Mary Greco